Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 16

Dr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Dr. Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina

Part X

Now let's first take up the case that people were killed during the time of the prophet.

I will mention for you here a few relevant translated passages of Mr Javed Ahmed Ghamidi's book "The Islamic Shari'ah of Jihad":

Dear readers: Please pay close attention to what Dr. Ghamidi writes. I think this is the climax of our debate and it is indeed the main fallacy that has kept Muslims trapped in the web of lies of Islam. Once the trap is identified, it is much easier to avoid it and I hope after this, those Muslims who are sitting on the fence can see for themselves that Islam is nothing but a huge hoax. I earnestly hope and expect that Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer also will see it. They are intelligent and good humans. They are trapped, not through their faults. All of us who were once believers were also trapped in the same web of lies. It is our circumstances that has set us free. I have no doubt that if I had not left Iran during my early teens, I would most likely rehash today the same things Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer are so convinced of. The environment influences the way we think. Those living in Islamic countries are kept in total darkness. Our respectable scholar friends contributed to that darkness by banning faithfreedom.org in Pakistan. They genuinely think they did the right thing. I know the feeling and do not blame them. Before my awakening when a friend expressed her curiosity to read Salman Rushdie's "Satanic Verses," I was angry at her and rebuked her for having such thought. Even though Dr. Ghamidi has blocked this site in Pakistan, to his credit, he has left the line of communication open and we are still talking. It shows he is more enlightened and open minded than yours truly, during my years of faithfulness and oblivion. This is no small feat for a Muslim who has lived his entire life in one of the most benighted Islamic countries such as Pakistan, where the general population is immersed in lies and cocooned in fallacies. While the masses of Iranians have had enough of Islam, the average Pakistanis would vote for Osama Bin Landen to become their president in a heartbeat. We must always keep in mind the milieu from which Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer come from. They are rare gems in a mine of coal even though as Muslims they think it is their responsibility to keep that coal in more darkness.

Peace and freedom are two essential requirements of a society. Just as various penal measures help in protecting a society from the evils and excesses committed by an individual, resorting to armed offensives sometimes becomes essential to curb the evils perpetrated by countries and nations. As long as diplomatic relations and negotiations can be used to resolve matters, no one would endorse the use of force for settling affairs. However, if a nation threatens to disrupt the peace and freedom of the world and its arrogance and haughtiness exceed all bounds, a stage may come when the use of force and power becomes essential to keep it in check. In such cases, it is the inalienable right of humankind to forcibly stop its subversive activities until peace and freedom of the world are restored. The Qur'an asserts that if the use of force had not been allowed in such cases, the disruption and disorder caused by insurgent nations would have reached the extent that the places of worship would have become deserted and forsaken, not to mention the disruption of the society itself:

"And had it not been that Allah set aside one people with another, the monasteries and churches, the synagogues and the mosques, in which His praise is abundantly celebrated would be utterly destroyed." (22:40)

This use of force is called jihad.

Let me interrupt you Dr. Ghamidi and tell you that I fully agree with what you said about peace and freedom being two essential requirements of any society and that they must be protected, if necessary through the use of force. I fully agree that if peace and freedom of the world are threatened all the world must rise to subdue the party that poses that threat. This happened in the first half of the last century when everyone formed an alliance to combat Nazism because it threatened the peace and freedom of the world. During the Gulf war, when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, again we saw all nations coming together to fight him and push him back. Just as no civilized society would tolerate a group of thugs and gangsters threaten the citizens and will use force to quash such hoodlums, the community of nations should also not tolerate a country threaten the peace and freedom of other nations. Like your good self, I am a fervent advocate of peace and freedom and I don't think freedom is free. Freedom must be earned and protected sometimes through war. So, as you see, far from being a pacifist, I strongly support war against aggression, bullishness and despotism. All it takes for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.

The part that you and I do not see eye to eye is the definition of peace and freedom. To me, peace is attained through fairness where equal rights of everyone is protected and freedom is when each person is free to believe in whatever he pleases and do whatever he wishes provided that his freedom does not infringe upon the freedom of others. Muslims, however, use the same terms but they intend entirely different things. Let us first resolve this problem. We must understand each other's language before we can talk.

When Muslims say peace, they mean non-Muslims should be subdued and humiliated to the extent that they have no strength to rebel. Peace, according to Islam, is therefore achieved through domination and subjugation. This is the kind of "peace and order" Saddam had

established in his country. No one could whisper a word of dissent or he was put to rest in peace. To the end he defended his actions and claimed that as the president of Iraq, he acted in accordance to the law - his own law - to secure peace and order in the country. Narcissists are unable to see the harm that they cause to others and have no pang of conscience. They justify all their evil deeds.

Freedom for Muslims also has a totally different connotation. For them freedom is attained through submission to Allah. Paradoxically you are only free when you have no thoughts of your own and have submitted your entire will to Allah and his messenger. Also this “freedom” is reserved only for Muslims. Non-Muslims must be subdued, humiliated, taxed or simply put to death.

Now that we clarified the difference between Islamic concept of freedom and freedom as the rest of the world understands it, and learned the difference between Islamic idea of peace and peace, the way others view it, you can see that if Muslims achieve their desired “peace and freedom” the rest of us will lose ours. It is important that we understand Muslims and what they mean when they use familiar words. If a wolf invites a sheep to dinner, it is likely that he does not have a meal for two in mind. Unless you know what Muslims really mean, words can be deceiving. As Dr. Ghamidi has made it clear, when Muslims talk about peace and freedom they mean our subjugation, dhimmitude or death. The concept of win/win and fairness is absent from Islamic psyche. Muslims are not satisfied; in fact they feel “oppressed” until they subjugate you or kill you, until you submit to them feeling subdued and humiliated. (Q. 9:29)

Dr. Ghamidi's definition of peace is as follow, which I quote again because of its importance:

> The Qur’an asserts that if the use of force had not been allowed in such cases, the disruption and disorder caused by insurgent nations would have reached the extent that the places of worship would have become deserted and forsaken, not to mention the disruption of the society itself:

As you see, the definition of freedom for our illustrious scholar friend is shoving religion down the throat of people with force.

Here is where the problem lies. Muslims want to establish their version of “peace and freedom” through warfare or as they call it “Jihad” which means we would lose ours. Therefore, if we want to protect our peace and freedom we must make sure that Muslims don't succeed in theirs and respond to their jihad and aggression with bigger force. It must be clear by now that Muslims want nothing short of our submission. Sadly, our peace and freedom and theirs are mutually exclusive because our understanding of these terms are different.

..

How can we protect our peace and freedom? This is an important question. The answer is a tough pill to swallow, but we must do it for our good, the good of our children and also for the good of Muslims.

There are three ways we can do it. The best way, is of course, to help them see the light and win them as allies and partners, so they stop seeing others as kafirs and their enemies deserving death and hellfire. This is what FFI is hoping to achieve and we are succeeding to a great extent. However, I am not naïf. Religion is a powerful narcotic and Islam is the most potent of all. We may open the eyes of a few, but the majority of Muslims will never wake up. In fact the masses of Muslims in Islamic countries are barred from accessing sites such as ours. Keeping Muslims ignorant is the duty of every Muslim and particularly their leaders.

The second alternative, that probably is more practical, is to reduce them to such a state of poverty that they forget about jihad and can think of nothing but how to earn their next meal. Only then, Jihad will be temporarily abandoned. According to the examples set by Muhammad, when Muslims are weak they are not supposed to wage Jihad. They have to sign peace treaties, wait for a better opportunity and strike when they are powerful and their chances of victory are great.

Dr. Sobhy, a Muslim scholar, in a footnote, commends the opinion of another scholar named Zarkashi who says: "Allah the most high and wise revealed to Mohammad in his weak condition what suited the situation, because of his mercy to him and his followers. For if He gave them the command to fight while they were weak it would have been embarrassing and most difficult, but when the most high made Islam victorious He commanded him with what suited the situation, that is asking the people of the Book to become Muslims or to pay the levied tax, and the infidels to become Muslims or face death. These two options, to fight or to have peace return according to the strength or the weakness of the Muslims."1

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip15.htm#_ftn1)

Dr. Muhsin Khan the translator of Sahih Bukhari and the Qur'an into English writes:

"Allah revealed in Sura Bara'at (Repentance, IX) [the order to discard (all) obligations (covenants, etc), and commanded the Muslims to fight against all the Pagans as well as against the people of the Scriptures (Jews and Christians) if they do not embrace Islam, till they pay the Jizia (a tax levied on the Jews and Christians) with willing submission and feel themselves subdued (as it is revealed in 9:29). So the Muslims were not permitted to abandon "the fighting" against them (Pagans, Jews and Christians) and to reconcile with them and to suspend hostilities against them for an unlimited period while they are STRONG and have the ability to fight against them. So at first "the fighting" was forbidden, then it was permitted, and after that it was made obligatory "[Introduction to English translation of Sahih Bukhari, p.xxiv.]

This sentiment was expressed by Dr. Mahathir the ex-Prime Minister of Malaysia who in the OIC (Organization of Islamic Conference) summit that he was hosting in his country in 2003, attended by the leaders of 57 Islamic countries, urged Muslims to put aside terrorism and

instead learn science and technology, improve their economy, become strong and with that wealth acquire “guns and rockets, bombs and warplanes, tanks and warships” and then jointly attack “their detractors and enemies” when their victory is assured. Dr. Mahathir was hailed as a moderate Muslim.

So, it is easy to see that to keep our peace and freedom, Muslims must be weakened and reduced to poverty, otherwise they will do what Dr. Sobhi, Dr. Khan, Dr. Mahathir and Dr. Ghamidi say they should. We would be fools if we don’t take these “moderate” scholars and Muslim leaders seriously.

This does not mean we should actually do anything to Muslims. It means we should leave them to their own devices and loosen their hands to destroy each other. Left to themselves, Muslims will self destruct. It is important that we subdue Islamic countries that pose danger to us, but we must not go out of our way to help them create democracy and improve their lives. Apart from the fact that Muslims have no use for democracy and despise it, as it is clear from what Dr. Ghamidi wrote, they will never be our friends and allies. Today in Iraq, the Sunnis and the Shiites are killing each other. We should get out of their way until they have had enough of it and sincerely want peace, the real peace, our version of it that means fairness for all and not subjugation of others. Both Sunnis and Shiites are our enemies. So whom are we aiding? We must cripple the Islamic regime of Iran or better topple it, because it is posing a serious threat to the peace of the world and get out of that region. Let nature take its own course. As the ancient Chinese sage Lao Zi said, by doing nothing we will accomplish more than by doing a lot. Let them wage jihad against each other. Muslims need to taste Islam in their flesh before they can say enough. That is what they are asking us too. They want America out of the region so they can tear each other apart. After nearly three decades of Islamic rule, the majority of Iranians have had enough of it. I can say, they are the only people in that region who are ready to get rid of Islam if given the chance. They paid the price to learn this lesson. Other Muslims must pay also to learn their lessons.

The threat of the Muslim immigrants living in the West should not be underestimated. Islam must be declared a subversive political movement and banned, and these Muslims who riot and burn our cities must be systematically rounded up and sent back to the country where they or their fathers or grandfathers came from as soon as they express anti western sentiments. This is consistent with what Muslims do to non-Muslims in Islamic countries. Non-Muslims in Islamic countries have no human rights. Jews have been living in Iran for at least 2500 years and they still are not recognized as full citizens. The Armenian an Assyrian Christians have been living in Iran for several centuries and they too are not treated as full citizens. As for Zoroastrians, the original owners of Iran, only a handful of them is left. Most of them sought refuge in India and in recent years they immigrated to Europe and America. The Baha'is fare worse, because they are deemed to be heretics. Muslims should be treated in accordance to the Islamic laws when they reside in the West. They should be treated as dhimmis, taxed and lose their freedom. I bet a taste from their own medicine will sober them and they will come to see how evil is Islam. As long as they are not the recipients of the

Islamic injustice, Muslims will never see its evilness. So as you see, leaving them to kill one another is actually good for them too. The alternative is disaster.

The third alternative, is confrontation. This means many of us would be killed in continuous Islamic terrorisms and a nuclear holocaust, which would trigger the total destruction of the Muslim world and the massacre of all of them in retaliation. There is a limit to human patience. Beneath this veneer of civility we are all animals and the sense of self preservation overrides every thing else. We do not have to get to this stage if we let Muslims do what Muslims do best, i.e. kill one another.

I have been debating with Muslims for the last nine years and I don't think I have ever seen anyone laying bare the truth about the danger of Islam as clearly as Dr. Ghamidi, so eloquently has done it. I urge all those who read this chapter to please let others read it too. Dr. Ghamidi is not just any Muslim. He is one of the top Islamic scholars of the world. He is also not a fanatical Muslim of the Taliban brand. He is, by all accounts, a moderate Muslim. He has actually received death threats and there have been attempts against his life by the more extremist Muslims. Yet this is how he thinks, expressed in clear language.

Dr. Ghamidi supported Dr. Amina Wadud when she led a congregation of men and women Muslims in prayer when most Muslims condemned it. This tells you how advanced are his thinking. He is exceptionally enlightened. However, don't be fooled. Just as he changed his mind and started defending intercession after having denounced it in his website, when I showed him that the Qur'an supports intercession, he will also change his position on the subject of women as soon as I show him that his views on this subject are contrary to the Qur'an. It would be interesting to learn what Dr. Ghamidi thinks about wife beating. That would be something to discuss in future when we talk about the status of women in Islam. For now, let us focus on the topic at hand. Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer are brilliant scholars and naturally good people, but at their hearts they are Muslims. A Muslim, is a Muslim, is a Muslim. Muslims fight amongst each other and denounce one another, but this does not mean that either one of them has the interest of humanity at heart.

Dr. Ghamidi believes that freedom means forcing people to worship in mosques, churches and synagogues and those who promote rationalism, or other religions of which Muhammad was ignorant are causing disruption and disorder. As a Muslim, he thinks that the gravest crime that deserves capital punishment is not worshipping Allah. Ironically, Christians and Jews have little freedom in Islamic countries. They can't, for example, restore their churches without the permission of the government, which is often denied, and they themselves are systematically persecuted. Needless to say that they are prohibited to proselytize their religions. So, what it boils down to is that only Muslims are entitled to freedom. The rest of mankind must either be put to death or reduced to dhimmitude if they do not want to convert.

One of the scourges of the Islamic republic of Pakistan is its blasphemy law. This law is contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is a blatant affront to the dignity

and freedom of humans. Does Dr. Ghamidi support this law? Well, by what he has stated in this article, he clearly does. If I am mistaken, I would like to hear his opinion on that.

Let us continue with Dr. Ghamidi's essay:

> This use of force is called jihad, and in the Qur'an it can be classified in two distinct categories:
>
> Firstly, it is done against injustice and oppression.
> Secondly, it is done against the deniers of the Prophet (sws) after the truth of his message had become evident to them.

Okay, we need to consult our Islamic dictionary to understand what Muslims mean by oppression and injustice. The word in the Qur'an, often translated into oppression and injustice, is *fitnah.* (See verse 2:193) Fitnah means sedition or disrupting the order. According to Muhammad those who opposed him were making fitnah. So, whenever Muslims complain of oppression, they mean opposition to Islam. I can't tell you how many times Muslims have complained that I am oppressing them. Now, any sane person can see that I have no means of oppression. All I have is a website where ex Muslims, non-Muslims and even Muslims express their views freely. How can free thought be oppressive to Muslims? If Muslims feel oppressed by that, relief is a click away. However, Muslims feel oppressed because we are exposing their belief and they can't refute our arguments logically. This causes them pain and stress. In their view, I am making sedition, disrupting their peace and as such I am an oppressor. Consequently Muslims feel absolutely justified to kill me. The thought that all humans are entitled to their thoughts and free to express them, does not enter into their crania. The comprehension of such a simple truism is beyond their ken. They may go as far as telling you that you are free to think what you want as long as you keep it to yourself. They simply cannot tolerate criticism and they go berserk if someone does it, as we all saw during the riots for a bunch of cartoons or for the comments made by the Pope.

The second category of people that should be put to death, as stated in the Qur'an is those who still decide to not believe in Islam after they are invited to convert or as Dr. Ghamidi says; have received the evidence of Islam. In simple language, once you are called to accept Islam you must either convert or be put to death.

The evilness of such doctrine is self explanatory. Each person has a different understanding of the truth. Even among Muslims, there are hundreds of sects and each thinks others are heretics and only they have found the truth. According to this mentality, all those who think they have found the truth (and this means every person in the world) can, or even must, force others to submit to their way of thinking under the pain of death. Of course, non-Muslims are not intolerant of those who do not agree with their faiths. A Hindu, for example, will never kill another person merely because his faith is different. No Jew, Christian, Buddhist, Sikh, Bahai, Zoroastrian or atheist will kill you because he thinks your faith is

wrong. This kind of intolerance exists only in the most evil totalitarian doctrines such as Nazism, bolshevism (communism) and Islam.

Now, let us suppose everyone converts to Islam. Will this end the bloodshed? Of course not! Despite the fact that hundreds of millions of people have been killed by Muslims during these 1400 years, this number thwarts in comparison to the number of Muslims that have been put to death by fellow Muslims of other sects. Muslims kill more Muslims than they kill non-Muslims. If ever the world is converted to Islam, these bloodsheds over whose interpretation of the Qur'an and Hadith is correct will only augment and mankind will be ushered into an era of perpetual killing and mayhem. This means the end of civilization and return to total barbarity. Those who think Satan exists are fully justified to say Islam is his way to destroy the world.

We can clearly see that Islamic countries are barbaric. However, the West still exerts a powerful influence on Muslims and holds them from reverting to total barbarity. Muslims want to impress the West and therefore they feign civility. To Muslims, image is everything. Once the whole world becomes Islamic, (this is only per say, because Islam is exposed and it will fall shortly) this planet will become the planet of apes. The extremists will be emboldened and the insanity that now is reigning in Islamic countries will be magnified a hundred fold, civilization will end and dark ages will begin. Imagine the entire world ruled by invigorated Taliban! They were the only Muslims who did not care about the opinion of the world. Even the wicked Iranian Mullahs and the Saudis are concerned about their image. Since there is no possibility of dissent in Islam and learning any knowledge contrary to the Qur’an is strictly prohibited, the dark age imposed by Islam will never end. The Islamic mentality of might in right will disallow any thinking person to express his views and this planet will be doomed.

Dr. Ghamidi continues:

> The first type of jihad is an eternal directive of the shari‘ah (Islamic law). As stated earlier, it is launched to curb oppression and injustice. [Sina: Read "opposition"]
> The second type, however, is specific to people whom the Almighty selects for delivering the truth as an obligation. They are termed as witnesses to the truth; the implication being that they bear witness to the truth before other people in such a complete and ultimate manner that no one is left with an excuse to deny the truth. Bearing witness to the truth in such a manner is called shahadah. In the history of mankind, for the very last time this status was conferred on the Prophet Muhammad (sws) and his nation, the Banu Isma‘il (the children of Ishmael, the elder son of Abraham):
>
> “And similarly, We have made you an intermediate community so that you bear witness [to this religion] before the nations, and the rasul bear such a witness before you.” (2:143)

Let us dissect this point as it is crucial. What does shahada mean? Shahada means stating that there is no other God but Allah and Muhammad is his messenger, forcefully and emphatically. That is the evidence that Dr. Ghamidi is talking about. Shahada means you

must accept Islam or die. This, to Muslims, is proof. Muslims don't think there is any need for logical argumentation as in their view the claim of Muhammad is self evident and those who do not see it are deaf, dumb and blind or arrogant. As you can witness, in all the debates that they held with this author, virtually all of them, with only a few exceptions, resorted to ad hominem, when they failed to defend Islam logically. I was threatened to either be found and put to death mercilessly or that I would burn in hell. Muslims believe might is right and all they need to do to prove that Islam is true is to overpower their opponents with brute force and threats. If that fails, insults will do.

You can read this sentiment expressed clearly in their emails to me, in the Muslims' Comments section of this site. They challenge me to meet them face to face if I am truthful. "If you are telling the truth, then why are you afraid of dying? Come forth and show your face," is the recurring theme in most emails they write. Muslims genuinely believe that once they kill the critics of Islam the supremacy of Islam is established and the hujjat (evidence) is completed. This is exactly what the Muslims historians have claimed after Asma and Abu Afak were assassinated in Medina a few months after Muhammad established his domain in that city. The ethos of might-is-right is the law of jungle that dominates the Islamic mindset.

In logics, this is called *argumentum ad baculum.* Argumentum ad baculum is when one tries to overpower his opponent with violence and threat of violence, and force him into submission. This threat can be of two kinds, overt and covert. The overt form is the use or threat of physical violence such as "slay the unbelievers wherever you find them." (Q. 9:5) The covert form is threatening the detractors with divine retribution, such as, "On the Day of Judgment We shall make him taste the Penalty of burning in Fire." (Q.22:9) There are many examples of both overt and covert threats in the Qur'an and in the history of Islam. Muslims believe threat is a good substitute for logical arguments. This was the way Muhammad made his conquests, he raided unwary villages with no warning, when people had gone out after their daily business and were not armed and after slaughtering their men and taking as slaves their women and children, he claimed Allah made them victorious. It was actually terrorism, and cowardice that made him victorious. He would besiege a fortress and tell its inhabitants to submit or to face extermination. He called that ultimatum, *itmam al hujjat* (giving the undeniable proof).

..

Dear Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer: Up to now I have been asking questions showing the errors of the Qur'an and you were defending that book. You gave your responses to the first three questions (I leave that to the readers to decide whether they were satisfactory or not) and you avoided the fourth. The fourth question was about whether souls will go to heaven/hell right after death occurs or they will disappear into nothingness until corpses arise in the Last Day to receive their judgment. Both these contradictory statements are made in the Qur'an. Which one is true and which one is a "satanic"? (put in the mouth of the prophet by Satan). Both can't be true.

I know this is a thorny question and few Muslims think about it. Since this question has no answer, it is better not to think about it because it may cause doubt and that is something that must be avoided at all costs. Muslims' solution to keep their faiths strong is to keep their heads deep in the ground. No wonder you blocked this site in Pakistan. If you had satisfactory answers to all my questions, why not let Muslims see the fallacy of our argument?

Believe me, this is not the most difficult question. I did not want to scare you so I asked the easy ones first, hoping to increase the heat gradually. I am sorry that you stopped answering them already. Or perhaps it is a good sign. It shows that you are thinking and realizing that this book you call the word of God is full of gross errors, absurdities and contradictions and that you can not logically defend it. The seed of doubt is sown in your mind. Unless you kill it because of your love for worldly power, this small doubt will grow and will have a domino effect. Soon you will come to see more errors in the Qur'an on your own and things that before made sense to you, will no longer do. This is the beginning of your enlightenment. You are good men. You don't belong to that evil cult. You are smart. This cult is made for stupid people not for people like you. This was how I received my enlightenment. It all started with a small doubt and then it grew like a snowball until I was freed completely. The process was painful but the pain was not caused by finding the truth. It was caused by shattering the lies. The more I was attached to a lie, the more painful it was to get rid of it. Truth does not hurt. Nothing feels better than freedom of mind. I have been on both sides of the fence and I can tell you, enlightenment and freedom is better than slavery of mind - much better.

The question remains how you could earn your living without Islam. Well, that is something you should resolve. I know a few people who also depended on Islam for their livelihood and who have done it. You can too. Like yourselves, they were good people who genuinely believed in Islam. My recommendation to them was to go slow. Find something honest to do. Making money by spreading lies and obscurantism is not an honest way of living. Whatever you do, please do not let the commodities that Islam offers you in this world take you to hell in the other.

..

Now, let us change roles. Please tell us about that hujjat, that “undeniable evidence” that you are talking about. Please give us one example of it. That is all I ask. I can show you hundreds of very stupid mistakes in the Qur'an and all I ask is that you show me one undeniable proof and I will declare you the victor of this debate and remove this site.

It is only logical to believe that if the Qur’an was from God, it should not have a single error. Only one error is enough to disqualify it as the word of God. We find hundreds of them in that book. However, let us be illogical. Let us overlook all the errors of the Qur’an and try to find a single “out of this world” verse in that book as if that would be enough to make Islam a true religion. This is how you, Dr. Zaheer, and most other Muslims have come to believe in this book, and that is why despite all the evil in it you can't let it go, Many Muslims are smart.

They see there are parts of the Qur'an that are unjust or plainly wrong, however they close their eyes to all that and are hooked by something that they think is miraculous and out of this world. I was one of them myself. It was not that I could not see anything wrong in Islam. But I silenced my conscience telling myself, "look at the big picture." Eventually I realized the big picture is made of all these errors and stupidities and it is very evil. There is, of course, nothing miraculous in the Qur'an. So, please show us at least one example of that undeniable proof. The ball is now in your court.

> Once the process of shahadah is complete, the truth is unveiled to a people in its ultimate form, and, if they still deny it in spite of being convinced about it, they are punished in this very world. At times, this punishment is through earthquakes, cyclones and other calamities and disasters, while, at others, it emanates from the swords of the believers. As a result, those who have denied the truth are totally vanquished in their land and the truth reigns supreme in it. In the case of Prophet Muhammad (sws), the Divine scourge took this very form. Consequently, just as his Companions (rta) were asked to wage war against oppression and injustice, they were also asked to wage war to punish the rejecters of his truth once it had become totally manifest to his addressees. This was actually a Divine plan executed through human beings. They themselves were not authorized to even think of such an undertaking. It is to this very fact which the following words of the Qur’an allude:
>
> “Fight them and God will punish them by your hands.” (9:14)

My erudite friends: you are building a tall tower, by placing one fallacy upon another. First of all, where is that “unveiled truth in its ultimate form?” I read the Qur’an and found nothing but factual inaccuracies, scientific heresies, historic blunders, mathematical mistakes, logical absurdities, grammatical errors and ethical fallacies. We have shown hundreds of those errors in this site and you can find more elsewhere. Will you now show us that undeniable truth of which you are talking?

Secondly, if you interpret natural disasters as punishment of God, then God must be punishing Muslims more because more of them die in these natural calamities. Of course it is absurd to think that the wise and compassionate maker of this universe resorts to such senseless acts of terrorism and kills wholesale so many people indiscriminately in order to punish some. If God had such a low self esteem that the disbelief of his own insignificant creatures hurt his feelings and if killing them was the only way he knew how to deal with this pain, (which would make him a true psychopath narcissist unworthy of worship) couldn’t he just kill the disbelievers selectively through, say, heart attack, stroke, cancer, etc, or just blow them into pieces and leave innocent children unharmed? Why is it that in these “acts of punishment” as you define them, mostly children are killed, who are by all accounts innocent? How can learned and intelligent men of your stature make such a statement?

Thirdly, you say that Allah gave Muhammad and his nation the right to wage war against the unbelievers whose mere disbelief is oppressing him. Will you please tell us, if this was what he wanted, and if he has any power, why he needed henchmen? Can't Allah kill those who

disbelieve in him without asking humans to shed the blood of humans? Is the god of Islam helpless to kill his detractors? Why like a gangster godfather, Allah relies on his followers to do his dirty work for him? Didn't he know that humans have low intelligence and they are fallible and as such it is possible that many of them start killing others thinking they are doing God's work when in reality they are mistaken? Tell me, are Shiites in the right when they kill the Sunnis or is it the other way round? Who gave them this idea that by killing they are doing God's work? Don't you see the root of all these problems affecting the Islamic world is the Qur'an? What kind of god is this Allah that orders people to shed the blood of their kind?

Fourthly, earlier, in defense of intercession that you yourself had originally repudiated, you said that God wants us to be compassionate towards one another and that is why he wants us to intercede for each other. Why this same god now wants us humans to shed the blood of our kind and become murderers and assassins? If he wanted people to have compassion for one another, shouldn't he have told them to be tolerant and forgiving of each other? What kind of people he wants to collect in his paradise? Are you sure he is God and not Satan? Allah's teachings are satanic. As they say, if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it must be a duck. If the teachings of the Qur'an look satanic, it is likely that it is a book of Satan and not of God. This is how you should have interpreted the parts of the Qur'an that you thought are out of this world. However, I assure you that there are no such parts in the Qur'an. So even if Satan has dictated this book of violent and absurdity to Muhammad, he has not given him a single secret of the unknown.

Can't you see how Muhammad fooled and manipulated the ignorant people around him to wage war and conquer the world for him? This man gave his foolhardy followers, vacuous promises of debauchery and eternal sex and they killed and died for him to make him the emperor, so he could have everyone at his service. As a viceroy of God, he assumed all His powers and had control over life and death of everyone. This is the wet dream of a narcissist psychopath. And you can't put the two together and read the mind of that sadist? This man, like Hitler, was a psychopath narcissist. All he cared for was domination. Allah was only his alibi. There is no way that the Almighty God can be as stupid and as evil as Muhammad portrayed him.

Islam is blasphemy. It is an insult to God. How can the almighty maker of this universe be so evil as Muhammad has described him? On one hand Muhammad called Allah merciful and on the other, he portrayed him as a petulant, needy, unforgiving, ruthless tyrant. How can anyone worship such a miserable despicable deity? Allah is not God. He is the figment of the sick mind of a psychopath narcissist. He is everything Muhammad wanted to be. He is nothing but that mad man's alter ego, his other alias. A billion people worship the creation of the mind of a narcissist and because of that, act like narcissists. They think they are superior and kill anyone who disagrees with them. And you have the chutzpa to call others idolaters? Islam is idolatry. Anyone whose god is a loving, forgiving and tolerant believes in the real God even if he calls it with many names. Allah is the only evil deity, This makes Muslims the only idolaters and Satan worshippers in the world. If anyone has to be sent to hell or punished for idolatry it is Muslims. What idolatry is greater than worshipping the fantasies of

a mentally deranged man? If this is not tragedy what is? Now that we have a better understanding of the world around us, we can see that nearly every statement in the Qur'an is false. One error is sufficient to discard that book and not even hundreds of them perturb your faith. Is this how you perceive logic?

Compare Muhammad to Jesus. How can God send two men so diametrically different as messengers to mankind? Is God getting senile by any chance? Was he drunk when he sent Muhammad? No sane person could say that Jesus and Muhammad were part of the same school and put them in the same category.

How can you be sure that it was not Satan who visited Muhammad claiming to be Gabriel? Do you have “undeniable evidence” to refute this hypothesis? Muhammad’s actions were satanic. The Qur'an is also satanic. Isn’t it logical to believe that Allah is Satan? Look at the misery of Muslims in Islamic countries. This is not because we are less intelligent than other nations. It is simply because we follow a satanic cult. How else can you explain the fact that virtually all Muslim countries are backward, barbaric and poor? The only exceptions are those that pump oil from the ground with the kafir technology to be used in kafir made cars. When that dries up, this Islamic euphoria will also dry up. Muslims will put aside Jihad when hungry and weak. So we should keep them hungry and weak for their own good. Why is it that the more Islamic is a country, the more backward it becomes? If Islam is good, why do you want Muslims to be moderate? Should we be moderate in something so good?

---

[1]

(https://www.faithfreedom.org/debates/Ghamidip15.htm#_ftnref1) Sobhy as_Saleh, Mabaheth Fi 'Ulum al- Qur'an, Dar al-'Ilm Lel-Malayeen, Beirut , 1983, p. 270